

However, last Thursday a U.S. District Court judge based in Washington, D.C. single-handedly decided to block this second amendment policy. Now there is a giant hole in the current Altmire language, and Congress must fix it. Congress must not allow one Federal judge to single-handedly deny Americans their second amendment rights on Federal land.

I have introduced an amendment, along with the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) to the omnibus lands bill that would write into law the very protections struck down by this lone Federal judge. The House must vote on this amendment to repair the big void in the current Altmire language contained in the omnibus lands bill. There should be no excuses, no more delays, no waiting for another day or another bill. The omnibus lands bill is the best place to fix what this Federal judge has done.

If we are going to pass a 1,200-page bill that dramatically expands Federal lands in our country, Congress must protect American second amendment rights while on these lands. The Constitution and the second amendment should not be pushed aside by an activist judge and a complacent Congress. House leaders must allow a vote on the Hastings-Bishop amendment to the omnibus lands bill to protect the gun rights of Americans when we take up this bill presumably tomorrow.

2010 BUDGET RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this week the House Budget Committee will mark up the concurrent budget resolution for fiscal year 2010. Over a month ago, President Obama submitted a budget plan focusing on economic recovery, strategic investments, and most importantly, fiscal responsibility. At this critical juncture in our history, President Obama's budget addresses the mistakes of the past, makes much-needed investments in the future, and will create a better future for all Americans.

As we debate the merits of this budget resolution, we must not forget that President Obama inherited deep deficits and an economic crisis from the Bush administration. This chart shows the budget deficit over the years of the Clinton administration, and what the Bush administration did to the budget. The Bush administration left behind a \$1.25 trillion deficit, a high unemployment rate, and an economy on the verge of collapse. President Obama came into office merely 2 months ago, but he has already successfully proposed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act which will create or save 3.5 million jobs.

The President's budget continues the path toward economic recovery and fiscal responsibility with many necessary investments in education. The Presi-

dent's budget expands access to college education by making the American Opportunity Tax Credit permanent and indexing Pell grants to keep pace with inflation and the skyrocketing cost of college education. The President also doubles funding for early Head Start and expands Head Start.

The President's budget calls for improving and expanding access to health insurance and lowering the cost of health care for every American. The President's budget includes several provisions to improve quality and efficiency in the health care system, saving the American people approximately \$300 billion over the next 10 years. The President believes that the only way to rein in the cost of government for the foreseeable future is to address the costs associated with health care, and this budget does that.

The President's budget also ensures that the Nation honors and cares for our veterans when they return home by increasing funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs by \$25 billion over the next 5 years. This increased funding will help the VA reduce their claims backlog and modernize and improve VA hospitals and facilities. These investments in the VA will help address the large influx of new veterans into the VA system from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

□ 1100

So, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most telling feature of the President's budget is that it is an honest measure of where we are and of where we are going. The Bush administration used phantom budget tactics to keep the costs of many expensive measures out of the budget. Unlike budgets submitted in the past few years, the Obama budget honestly includes the cost of our military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and other items that we know we must pay for and have paid for every year such as the Medicare Doctor's Payment Fix and the Alternative Minimum Tax. President Obama's budget takes the necessary steps to put the budget back on a fiscally sustainable path once the economy recovers. The budget proposes to cut the deficit in half by 2013. Additionally, the President's budget proposes to restore the fiscally responsible pay-as-you-go rules, which were critical in turning the budget around in the 1990s.

Many may claim that the President's budget will cause deficits, but those who advocate the problems with the President's budget fail to remind themselves that the policies that they, in fact, are advocating are the policies that got us in the ditch we are in today. What they forget is that this Nation had to endure 8 years of failed economic policies, which produced one of the worst recessions in 70 years, the worst job growth since the Great Depression, an increase in the number of Americans living in poverty, and an increase in the number of Americans living without health insurance.

Furthermore, the Bush administration degraded the Federal budget's condition from healthy to weak, converting a 10-year \$5.5 trillion surplus to more than a \$3 trillion deficit—a swing of more than \$9 trillion over 8 years and an average of over \$1 trillion a year.

Mr. Speaker, these policies have failed. It is time to turn to the policies that work. The President's budget does just that. As a member of the House Budget Committee, we look forward to Wednesday's markup to ensure that the congressional budget resolution reflects the priorities of the President's budget.

CONSISTENCY, NOT CHAOS IN OUR PUBLIC LAND POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all know the old story of the newlywed couple whose wife on her first meal that she prepares of a cooked ham presents the ham, and the two ends have been cut off.

When her husband asks why, she says, "I don't know. That's the way my mother did it," and when the mother-in-law shows up, they ask why, and she says, "I don't know. That's the way my mother did it," and when the grandmother finally arrives and they ask why she cut the ends of the ham off, the grandmother simply says, "I have a small oven. A full ham won't fit."

There are many things we do in government that are traditions that are as totally illogical as cutting the ends of the ham off. Only in a Federal court in this United States can we find a special interest group that can track down a maverick judge that contends that 8 months of study by the Department of Interior is, in fact, a last-minute review and because, in January of this year, the Department of Interior and the National Park Service finally updated its rules to allow concealed carry on national parks lands and make it consistent with our policy of concealed carry on all public lands.

You see, the national forest does not prohibit someone with a valid concealed carry license from going on public lands. The Bureau of Land Management, which manages some of our national parks, does not prohibit a valid concealed carry permit for going on their lands. Even President Clinton gave an executive order saying that our policies should reflect the State prerogative and authority. Only the National Park Service has tried to prohibit that practice, and the National Park Service is not just things like Yellowstone. It is virtually impossible, or at least it will challenge you, to try to get from Virginia into Washington, D.C. without either driving or walking on National Park Service land. You go in and you go out. There are no signs to tell you what you were doing, and indeed, law-abiding citizens have been

entrapped on park service land, carrying a concealed weapon permit, where if they had gone a couple of blocks further and had been back in Virginia, they would have, indeed, been legal. That is illogical and it is also unfair.

What we should do is what the National Park Service decided to do in January and simply say State laws will be the ruling procedure. If it is legal for a concealed carry in this State, it is legal on all lands that are owned and controlled by the Federal Government, not just some lands "yes" and some lands "no."

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington has an amendment that should be put on the bill that will be before us tomorrow to clarify once again that the policy of the United States should be consistent on all of their lands, not on some "yes" and some not on the others. It was an amendment that would bring respect back to the policy and the consideration and the study done by the Department of Interior, and it would reject an outstandingly flawed decision made by a judge that actually creates chaos rather than solving this particular problem.

It is important that the Rules Committee does open up this particular bill for allowing the Hastings amendment so that we could actually debate this issue on the floor, because this is the proper time; this is the proper vehicle, and it is the right time for us to have consistency on our public land policy, not chaos in our public land policy, created by a judicial decision.

CYBER ATTACKS TO AMERICA'S NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss a critical national security challenge and what I believe is an imminent threat to the safety of our country. That is cyber attacks.

Computers control everything from our banking systems to our electric grid, our military networks to our businesses and government functions. Never in the history of the world have so many people had so much access to ideas, knowledge and skills. However, increased access also opens up additional vulnerabilities that allow our adversaries to potentially cause catastrophic economic and physical harm to our country. Nation-states, terrorists and other actors who seek to harm our Nation understand that the future of warfare is through cyber attack.

In recent years, American military leaders have noted an unfortunate increase in cyber attacks. The vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, James Cartwright, told Congress in March 2007 that America is under widespread attack right now in cyberspace.

But securing our networks is not simply the responsibility of the U.S.

military. Mitigating vulnerabilities in America's critical infrastructure networks involves the work of a wide variety of government agencies and private-sector entities. Everyone, both in the public and private sectors, plays a role in securing cyberspace, and we must all work together to confront these threats.

Our Nation has some significant challenges ahead of us in the cyber security world. Right now, the United States is under attack, and quite frankly, we are losing the battle. I believe that it is essential that we act swiftly and boldly to respond to this threat.

I recently cochaired the CSIS Commission on Cyber Security for the 44th Presidency. Our goal was to develop recommendations for a comprehensive strategy to improve cyber security in Federal systems and in critical infrastructure. This commission was made up of renowned cyber security experts from across the country, both in and out of government.

In December 2008, after hundreds of hours of briefings, of working group meetings and discussions, we released our final report proposing a number of recommendations for the incoming administration to consider. Among the most critical and timely of those recommendations is the creation of a comprehensive national security strategy for cyberspace. "Comprehensive" means using all of the tools of U.S. power in a coordinated fashion: international engagement and diplomacy, military strategy and action, economic policy tools, and the work of the intelligence and law enforcement communities.

This strategy should begin with a public statement by the President that the cyber infrastructure of the United States is a vital asset for national security and the economy and that we will protect it by using all instruments of our national power. The commission also recommends that the Nation's cyber leadership be housed in the White House, not in any single agency.

We used the response to nuclear proliferation as a model for how to approach cyber security. Just as no single agency is in charge of nonproliferation, we recognize that the same is true for cyber policy.

To coordinate these efforts, we proposed creating a new office for cyberspace in the executive office of the President. This office would combine existing entities and would also work with the National Security Council in managing the many aspects of securing our national networks while protecting privacy and civil liberties. It is my hope that the leadership of this new office will be an assistant reporting directly to the President.

I am very pleased with President Obama's appointment of Melissa Hathaway to conduct a 60-day inter-agency review of the Federal cyber security mission. I think she is very knowledgeable of the issues sur-

rounding the CNCI, and I have spoken with her regularly, encouraging her to review our critical infrastructure's defensive posture.

We have so many agencies that share in overseeing critical infrastructure protection that many issues fall through the cracks. This is an area I believe that we must improve on, and I look forward to working on legislation to implement the recommendations of the commission to ensure that our Nation is protected in cyberspace, and I certainly look forward to working with the administration on this important issue.

ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, what we do here in Washington, the policies that we make, have direct economic consequences on the market, on job creation or loss, on retirement accounts, and on the financial security of the American people.

For example, yesterday, Secretary Geithner finally released the administration's plan for dealing with the troubled assets that are dragging down our banks and that are impeding our Nation's economic recovery. The market jumped up 500 points.

Now, we still need to do some work to evaluate exactly how this plan will work and whether it is the best plan for the country, but I think this is a perfect example of how our actions here in Washington affect Wall Street.

I have a chart here with some data that I have assembled for the last 30 years, from 1977 to 2009, of market activity, and I want to show a broad trend that we see over that time regarding the market's reaction to government policies:

Here on the top, this yellow line, is the Dow Jones Industrial Average. You will see the red and blue panels. The colors here indicate which party is in control of Congress. So, where you have red, that is the control of the Congress, both the House and Senate, by Republicans. Where you have blue, that is the control of the Congress by the Democrats, both House and Senate. Where you have these slash/slanted marks, you have a divided Congress.

From 1977 to 1995, you see the Dow Jones growing gradually, minimal growth. You see when it hits the red panel that it moves sharply up. When you have, actually, the dot-com collapse and 9/11 and the divided Congress, you see it goes down. When it hits the red, it goes sharply up again.

The next chart down below shows budget deficits from 1977 to 2009. The bars above represent deficits. The bars below represent surpluses. Notice under President Obama that this last bar, the yellow line, is \$1.752 trillion for fiscal year 2009. Let me just put that into perspective. That single deficit is more than the previous eight